REMARKS

In this paper, we amended various claims and added some new claims. Although filed after final rejection, this amendment is still proper since it is being filed with RCE paperwork.

SPECIFICATION

The office action objected to the disclosure because the characters 16, 18, and 28 of Figures 7, 10, and 12 were not mentioned in the description. Also, characters 18 and 28 of Figures 7, 10, and 12 were said to be lacking description in the specification in relation to the objects displayed in the figure.

We reviewed the specification, and kindly disagree The cited characters are present in specification at various instances. Some examples include page 8, line 27 (ref. 16); page 18, lines 3, 17, 19 (ref. 18); page 9, line 19 (ref. 28). Item 18 is said to be a modem, and item 28 said to be a router, and we submit that their description in the specification is adequate in regard to the Figures.

In our review of the specification, however, we did discover inconsistent use of reference numeral 16. Our enclose amendments to the specification and drawings are aimed at correcting this.

DRAWINGS

We have amended sheet 1 of 12 in the drawings by changing a reference numeral "16" to - -20- -. We request the Examiner's approval of this drawing change.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-42

The office action rejected all pending claims under 35 USC 102(e) in view of Teo (US 7 293 077). The Teo relates to a computer network with a configurable router and various networked objects, where the network is configured to allow addition, deletion, and movement of networked objects within the network. [Teo: col. 1, lines 50-66] Teo is aimed at solving the problem of having to manually reconfigure a network when Internet-enabled devices move from one network or node to another. [Teo: col. 1, lines

15-45] For a number of reasons, the claims (as amended) are patentably distinguished over Teo.

Taking claim 1 as an example, Teo does not show the claimed "message processor for parsing a query message from a client to extract a network device source address and a query therefrom, for processing said query to retrieve requested information from a directory table, and for returning said information to said client in reply to said query message...wherein said message processor determines if said device identity information satisfies said query."

Although Teo purportedly uses a router capable of processing various requests such as DNS, DHCP, and ARP, there is no explicit disclosure in Teo of a message processor parsing a query message from a client to extract a network device source address and a query. Nor is there any disclosure of such a message processor determining if device identity information satisfies the query.

Although Teo is purported to show a routing table, there is no disclosure of querying such a table according to a client initiated query. In one instance, Teo's routing table is said to route messages to and from the configurable router. This routing table is said to include, for each link layer identifier, a corresponding network layer identifier, a corresponding point-to-point link identifier and a corresponding network interface, wherein the network interface indicates the location associated with the router through which communications are made to the networked object associated with each link layer identifier. [Teo: col. 2, line 50 – col. 5, line 31]

Teo further mentions a transparent router that operates by use of a routing table. This routing table is said to be dynamically updated. Each routing entry has associated with it the link layer identifier (LLI) of the network node for which the entry was inserted. The link layer identifier in this case may or may not include virtual local area network (VLAN) identifier in addition to the network node's LLI. Alternatively, the necessary information may be separated into a routing table and a switching table, as is commonly done in existing layer three switches. [Teo: col. 7, lines 1-15]

Further, Teo's Figure 8 is said to show a routing table. The table of Figure 8 includes items such as link layer identifier (LLI), point to point link identifier (PPLI), network layer identifier (NLI), and network interface (dev). There is nothing, however, to

suggest a reason for querying the table on behalf of a client. Rather, the routing table is for use by a router in performing routing operations.

Accordingly, claim 1 is distinguished from Teo. Independent claims 15 and 29 are distinguished for the same reasons. And, even without having to individually discuss the merits of the claims depending from claims 1, 15, or 29, these are patentable by virtue of such dependence.

NEW CLAIMS

The new claims are amply supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed. Accordingly, we have not added any new matter. Some examples of the many instances of support include ref. 20 (Figs. 1-2), refs. 14, 24, 22 (Fig. 1), refs. 30, 12, 32, 26 (Fig. 1), ref. 42 (Fig. 2), ref. 54a (Fig. 4A), ref. 56b (Fig. 8), ref. 54e (Fig. 11), ref. 54f (Fig. 13), page 11 (line 9) through page 14 (line 7).

The added claims are patentably distinguished for similar reasons as discussed above, as well as further reasons particular to the language unique to the added claim language. For instance, Teo does not teach a directory table "containing a listing of the network devices and prescribed data associated with each listed network device, the prescribed data including the source address and device identity information assigned to the listed network device." Teo's routing table is distinctly different, as discussed above in detail.

Teo further lacks a message processor programmed to perform operations including "responsive to receiving network devices' assigned source addresses and device identity information, registering said received addresses and information in the directory table." Teo is silent as to the storage of such data.

Furthermore, Teo does not address a client query seeking network devices satisfying stated criteria, accessing the directory table to identify any listed devices satisfying the criteria, and responding with an identification of any network devices satisfying the query. As mentioned above, Teo's routing table is used by Teo's routers to route information, rather than to identify network devices. And, as to Teo's DHCP, ARP, and DNS requests, Teo does lacks disclosure indicating how or why these would be adapted to satisfy client requests for network devices satisfying stated criteria.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all claims in the application are distinguished over the applied art. We kindly request favorable reconsideration and allowance of all claims in the application.

FEES

If fees are required, please charge the required fees (or credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 07-1445.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862